

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in the present application. Claim 13 has been amended as a result of this response. Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 13 and dependent claims 2-12 stand in condition for allowance. No claims have been canceled and no new claims have been added.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner has rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As the Examiner will note, claim 13 has been amended to recite a “printing service program stored on a computer readable medium for causing a computer to execute processing to translate instructions for displaying image data.”

In view of the above amendment, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 13 is directed to statutory subject matter. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner’s rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 are therefore respectfully requested.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 6 and 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Watanabe et al. (U.S. 6,877,031 B2). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Watanabe teaches a network photograph system that stores images and allows a user to select a number of images from the stored images to be distributed to a number of users. A user may register with the site, obtaining a user ID and password, and will be allowed access to upload images to view and distribute images corresponding to their user ID and password. Images can be electronically mailed to a destination address wherein a thumbnail size picture is enclosed or a clickable URL is included in the mail. If the receiver of the electronic mail wishes to purchase any of the images they may do so by first registering with the site and obtaining a user ID and password. Then the receiving user may select any of the images registered with their account and have them sent to a laboratory for printing.

The present invention teaches a printing service system and a printing service program in which a user who is unaccustomed to machine operations may print an image with ease. (page 2, line 22) The printing service system includes a code conversion means for converting the ID and the password into a code storing information on the ID and the password and a code transmission means for transmitting the obtained code to the address by the destination input means. (page 3, line 21 – page 4, line 15) Further when the print terminal decodes the code to the ID and the password and transmits the ID and password, performing authentication using the ID and the password, if a positive result is obtained the image data is read corresponding to the ID from the image data accumulation means and returns the image data to the prints terminal so that the user can print the image. (page 3, line 21 – page 4, line 15) Under this structure, the user never has to remember their ID and password, they can simply use an encrypted code that is generated by the printing service system. (page 4, lines 9- 15)

Watanabe fails to teach “a code conversion means for converting the ID and the password into a code storing information on the ID and the password.” (claim 1) In addition, Watanabe fails to teach “a code transmission means for transmitting the obtained code to the address inputted by the destination input means.” (claim 1) Further, Watanabe fails to teach “an image data returning means for, when the print terminal decodes the code to the ID and the password and transmits the ID and the password, performing authentication using the ID and the password and, if a positive authentication result is obtained, reading the image data corresponding to the ID from the image data accumulation means and returning the read image data to the print terminal.” (Claim 1) Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Watanabe fails to anticipate Applicants’ claimed invention for at least the reasons set forth above with regards to independent claim 1.

Applicants submit that claims 2, 6 and 8-11 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency either directly or indirectly on claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 5, 7, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al. (U.S. 7,228,339 B2) further in view of Yamamoto et al. (U.S. 7,228,339 B2). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Yamamoto does not remedy the noted deficiencies of Watanabe. Yamamoto is only relied upon to teach dependent claim features. This reliance on Yamamoto fails to make up for the deficiencies of Watanabe discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, the asserted combination of Watanabe and Yamamoto (assuming these references may be combined, which Applicants do not admit) fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness of any pending claim.

Therefore, for at least the reasons raised above with regards to Watanabe under §102, the combination of Watanabe in view of Yamamoto under §103, fails to cure the deficiencies of Watanabe under §102, and fails to render the claimed invention obvious. Applicants submit that claims 3, 5, 7, 12 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

With regards to claim 13, Watanabe fails to at least discuss “converting by the server the ID and the password into a code having an information on the ID and the password” (claim 13); “transmitting the code by the server to the address inputted in the address input step” (claim 13); “decoding by the print terminal the code so as to return it into the ID and the password and transmit the ID and the password to the server” (claim 13); and “performing authentication by the server using the ID and the password obtained through decoding” (claim 13). As above, and for the specific reason raised against claim 13, Watanabe fails to render claim 13 obvious under § 103(a) for at least the same reasons as applied above under §102.

In an attempt to provide what is lacking in Watanabe, the Examiner has applied Yamamoto. As understood, Yamamoto discusses a storage output system wherein the user inputs a password and ID to obtain stored information. (Figure 1) With most passwords and IDs sent over the internet it is desirable to use an encryption method such as SSL as taught in Yamamoto. Yamamoto fails to at least disclose forming a code from a password and ID. In fact,

as shown in Figure 1, the user must still enter their password and ID. Encryption as described in Yamamoto is only used to prevent hackers or others on the internet from receiving this private information.

Watanabe in view of Yamamoto does not teach, disclose, or suggest “converting by the server the ID and the password into a code having information on the ID and the password.” (claim 13) In addition Watanabe in view of Yamamoto does not teach, disclose, or suggest “transmitting the code by the server to the address inputted in the address input step.” (claim 13) Further, Watanabe in view of Yamamoto does not teach, disclose, or suggest “decoding by the print terminal the code so as to return it into the ID and the password and transmit the ID and the password to the server.” (claim 13) Also, Watanabe fails to teach, disclose or suggest “performing authentication by the server using the ID and the password obtained through decoding.” (claim 13). This reliance on Yamamoto fails to make up for the deficiencies of Watanabe discussed above with respect to claim 13. Therefore, the asserted combination of Watanabe and Yamamoto (assuming these references may be combined, which Applicants do not admit) fails to establish prima facie case of obviousness of any pending claim.

Applicants submit that claim 13 is allowable and accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al. (U.S. 7,228,339 B2) further in view of Banerjee et al. (U.S. 6,748,296 B2). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Banerjee does not remedy the noted deficiencies of Watanabe. Banerjee is only relied upon to teach dependent claim features. This reliance on Banerjee fails to make up for the deficiencies of Watanabe for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 under §102. Therefore, the asserted combination of Watanabe and Banerjee (assuming these references may be combined, which Applicants do not admit) fails to establish prima facie obviousness of any pending claim under §103.

Applicants submit that claim 4 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All matters having been addressed in view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the immediate allowance of all pending claims.

Applicants' undersigned representative remains ready to assist the Examiner in any way to facilitate and expedite the prosecution of this matter. If any point remains an issue in which the Examiner feels would be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account No. 02-2448. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any overpayments to the above-referenced deposit account.

Dated: February 26, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By  46469

Michael K. Mutter WILLIAM TITCOMB

Registration No.: 29,680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant